

among the dead. "Now there is a terror here."

Officials at the 1st Brigade said they were alerted at 8:45 a.m. when the National Police chief for Sucre reported a possible paramilitary "incursion" in Chengue. According to a military log, Parra dispatched two helicopters to the village at 9:30 a.m. and the Dragon company of 80 infantry soldiers based in nearby Pijiguay five minutes later. Villagers said the troops did not arrive for at least another two hours.

When they did arrive, according to logs and soldiers present that day, a gun battle erupted with guerrillas from the FARC's 35th Front. Parra said he sealed the roads into the zone "to prevent the paramilitaries from escaping." The battle lasted all day—the air force sent in one Arpia and three Black Hawk helicopters at 2:10 p.m., according to the military—and village residents waved homemade white flags urging the military to stop shooting. No casualties were reported on either side. No paramilitary troops were captured.

Three days later, the 1st Brigade announced the arrest of eight people in connection with the killings. They were apprehended in San Onofre, a town 15 miles from Chengue known for a small paramilitary camp that patrols nearby ranches. Villagers say that, though they didn't see faces that morning because of the darkness, these "old names" are scapegoats and not the men who killed their families.

A steady flow of traffic now moves toward Ovejas, jeeps stuffed with everything from refrigerators to pool cues to family pictures. The marines have set up two base camps in Chengue—one under a large shade tree behind the village, the other in the vacant school. The remaining residents do not mix with the soldiers.

"We have taken back this town," said Maj. Alvaro Jimenez, standing in the square two days after the massacre. "We are telling people we are here, that it is time to reclaim their village."

No one plans to. Marlena Lopez, 52, lost three brothers, a nephew, a brother-in-law and her pink house. Her brother, Cesar Lopez, was the town telephone operator. He fled, she said, "with nothing but his pants."

In the ashes of her home, she weeps about the pain she can't manage. "We are humble people," she said. "Why in the world are we paying for this?"

RECOGNIZING THE MASSACHUSETTS DIVISION I STATE CHAMPIONS LUDLOW HIGH SCHOOL GIRLS SOCCER TEAM

HON. RICHARD E. NEAL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today I recognize the achievements of the 2000 Ludlow High School girls soccer team. This past season the Ludlow girls team compiled a record of 21-0-0 en route to earning the Coombs Division League Championship, the Western Massachusetts Division I Championship, and the Massachusetts Division I State Championship. Their efforts enabled them to earn a ranking of 3rd in the country.

Each year the Commonwealth of Massachusetts fields many talented high school soccer squads. Every season the Ludlow community looks forward to cheering on their hometown heroes. This year the Lions certainly did not

disappoint. Finishing a season undefeated and untied, as the Ludlow girls did, is a feat well deserving of high praise. The Ludlow girls soccer team rose to the challenge each and every game. They are winners in every sense of the word and are examples of athletic prowess, class, and true sportsmanship.

For leading his team to such accomplishments, Head Coach Jim Calheno has been named the Massachusetts Division I Girls' Coach of the Year. Under his leadership, the Lions have remained a perennial powerhouse. His assistants are tireless and deserve praise as well. In addition I would like to note that senior midfielder Liz Dyjak has earned All-American honors while senior forward Stephanie Santos has been named to the All-New England team.

Mr. Speaker, allow me to recognize here the players, coaches, and managers of the 2000 Ludlow High School girls soccer team. The seniors are: Jessica Vital, Lindsay Robillard, Sarah Davis, Lindsay Haluch, Nikky Gebo, Liz Dyjak, Kara Williamson, Stephanie Santos, and Ana Pereira. Kristine Goncalves is a Junior on the squad. The Sophomores are: Darcie Rickson, Beth Cochenour, Natalie Gebo, and Lauren Pereira. Freshmen members include Jessica Luszczyk, and Stefany Knight. The Head Coach is Jim Calheno. Assistant Coaches are Saul Chelo, James Annear, Nuno Pereira, and Tony Vital. The team manager is Katie Romansky.

Mr. Speaker, once again, allow me to send my congratulations to the Ludlow High School girls soccer team on their outstanding season. I wish them the best of luck in the 2001 season.

H.R. 93, THE FIREFIGHTERS RETIREMENT AGE CORRECTION ACT

HON. FORTNEY PETE STARK

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Mr. STARK. Mr. Speaker, I was a cosponsor of H.R. 460, the Federal Firefighters Retirement Age Correction Act in the 106th Congress and would have voted to support H.R. 93 yesterday. Unfortunately, due to an unforeseen family illness, I was absent and not able to vote in support of H.R. 93, the Federal Firefighters Retirement Age Correction Act. I would like the RECORD to reflect my support for H.R. 93.

RECOGNIZING BETTY FITZPATRICK

HON. THOMAS G. TANCREDO

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Mr. TANCREDO. Mr. Speaker, today, I am pleased to recognize Ms. Betty Fitzpatrick from Evergreen, Colorado, who was selected by the National Association of School Nurses (NASN) as the School Nurse Administrator of the year for 2000. Recently, NASN hosted an event for Ms. Fitzpatrick on Capitol Hill to honor her, and to applaud her for her excellent work on behalf of the public school children in my district.

As a former public school teacher, I had first-hand experience in seeing the hard work of our Nation's school nurses. All teachers know that being a good student require a degree of good health, and I appreciate the work of Ms. Fitzpatrick in organizing health efforts for the children in my district and wish to extend my personal congratulations.

It is important to note that the work of many school nurses, like Ms. Fitzpatrick, goes beyond the assistance they provide directly to students. They serve as mentors to their colleagues, and serve an array of needs ranging from medical ailments to counseling for a student who needs a listening ear. Betty Fitzpatrick, especially, has participated in training for and as a consultant to school nurses, to assist them in developing crisis plans, and in dealing with tragic situations.

Ms. Fitzpatrick has spent her personal and professional life advocating children's physical and mental health while supporting school nursing. For the past 11 years she has served as the Director of Health Services for all 136 Jefferson County Schools in Golden, Colorado. She has been the president and treasurer of her state organization, a prolific author, an advocate for legislation, a grant writer and a national presenter.

The NASN newsletter reported that aside from the day to day challenges of being a school nurse administrator, Ms. Fitzpatrick had the great misfortune of dealing with an incomprehensible tragedy, which took place at one of her high schools—Columbine. Within minutes, she was contacted, and her emergency plan was activated. She and her nurses didn't wait for instructions, they knew what needed to be done, and they got to work. As the newsletter stated, the Columbine tragedy wounded a nation, but Betty continues to meet the unique needs of this school community and the others she serves.

Again, I am delighted by this honor that Ms. Fitzpatrick has brought to the State of Colorado, and I offer my sincere congratulations.

HONORING GAYE LEBARON

HON. LYNN C. WOOLSEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Gaye LeBaron. For 43 years Gaye LeBaron's columns in the Santa Rosa Press Democrat have recorded and enlivened Sonoma County and the Redwood Empire. By personalizing the community's history and sense of place with honesty and good humor, LeBaron captured the respect and the hearts of her readers.

In her 8,000 columns LeBaron demonstrated that quality journalism can be witty, insightful, and compassionate. She worked as an observer and story teller, yet did not hesitate to take a stand—on issues as great as racial discrimination or as mundanely important as street lights—when it was needed. Whether focusing on the quirkiness of every day happenings or wrapping the reader in the sweep of North Coast history, Gaye LeBaron's colorful depictions made life what it is—interesting and personal.

LeBaron has also devoted her time and expertise to community causes through teaching,

speaking, fundraising, and serving as a resource where needed. Her work interviewing local elders for a video history project with the Sonoma County Museum will stand with her columns as a testament to this special region and the spirit of its people.

I can say personally that being included in a Gaye LeBaron column is a coveted experience. We will miss Gaye on a daily basis but will look forward to her continuing contributions.

DAVID A. HARRIS GIVES
THOUGHTFUL INSIGHT ON
ISRAEL'S DIFFICULT POLITICAL
AND SECURITY CHOICES

HON. TOM LANTOS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 31, 2001

Mr. LANTOS. Mr. Speaker, finding a peaceful solution to the problems in the Middle East has long been an important concern of the United States. Attempts to reach a resolution of these difficulties, unfortunately have thus far failed.

While workable solutions have been found in short supply, a number of extremely helpful insights have been put forward. In this regard, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to a particularly insightful article by David A. Harris, Executive Director of the American Jewish Committee. Although it was written before the inauguration of the new American President and prior to the latest of peace negotiations ending in a stalemate, the insights that Mr. Harris provides are still timely and important.

Mr. Speaker, I commend David Harris' thoughts to my colleagues and urge them to give his article careful attention.

AS ISRAEL MAKES FATEFUL POLITICAL AND
SECURITY CHOICES, ITS FRIENDS ABROAD
ALSO ARE CONFRONTING HARD TRUTHS

(By David A. Harris, Executive Director, The American Jewish Committee, Jan. 4, 2001)

In recent months, like many friends of Israel, I've had my share of sleepless nights. With only a few brief moments of either hope or respite, the news has been unrelentingly disturbing and depressing. Israel is once again under siege. Every corner of Israel, every Israeli is a potential target. There is no distinction between soldier and civilian, between adult and youth, between dove and hawk, between believer and atheist, or between those living within and those living beyond the Green Line. It may not be all-out war as we saw in 1967 or 1973, but it is a calculated Palestinian strategy to obtain through violence what they have heretofore failed to achieve by negotiation.

Some Israelis and their friends abroad react to this volatile situation by beating their breasts and asking yet again what more Israel might do to meet demands of the Palestinians. Others, at the opposite end of the political spectrum, conclude that not only is the pursuit of peace a dangerous dream but, even more, a risk to the very existence of the state.

DECISIONS ON WAR AND PEACE

As I see it, Israel has no clear option, no obvious way to turn, and its predicament is further exacerbated by its complex and polarized domestic situation. In saying this, I

do not wish to second-guess the Israeli government and people. I have always taken the view that it is for them, first and foremost, to make the fateful decisions about war and peace and the steps that can lead in either direction. And the sheer survival of Israel over 52 years, not to mention its remarkable growth and development, adequately attests to its uncanny ability to overcome the odds, confound the skeptics, and disprove the doomsayers. Even as I openly worry about the future, then, I am inspired and reassured by Israelis' determination to go on, to fight when necessary, to negotiate for peace whenever possible.

Today we are confronted with a situation that few, especially in the West, might have predicted. A dovish Israeli government—prepared to cross its own red lines, especially regarding the future status of Jerusalem, in the pursuit of an historic peace agreement with the Palestinians—is faced with violence in the streets, calls for jihad, and terrorist attacks in the heart of the country, while the Arab world lines up foursquare behind the Palestinians and seeks to isolate Israel by depicting it as the trigger-happy-aggressor, the Nazi reincarnation.

Thus, instead of grasping Israel's outstretched hand and seeking to resolve outstanding issues, however challenging, at the bargaining table, the Palestinians perceived instead a weakened Israel. If proof was needed, it came for them in the unilateral decision to withdraw from Southern Lebanon after Israeli mothers led a campaign to bring their sons home before more were killed at the hands of Hizbullah; in Prime Minister Barak's determination to make peace before the end of the Clinton presidency, which was, in the final analysis, an artificial deadline; and in Israel's perceived vulnerability to the sting of international censure, given Barak's efforts to undo the global public relations impact of the Netanyahu years.

In effect, Arafat, though the weaker party by far, has skillfully leveraged his position, emerging stronger than might have been imagined. He has, for example, already managed to prove once again that violence does pay—the current deal being brokered by the White House and given tentative approval by Barak appears to go beyond the package on the table at Camp David in July. If so, why should Arafat, from his point of view, stop here?

VIOLENCE AND NEGOTIATIONS

Eager to see his long-sought Palestinian state emerge from the "honor and blood" of the martyred, ever mindful of the most radical elements among the Palestinians, and determined not to demand less than Anwar Sadat, King Hussein, or Hafaz el-Assad in insisting on Israeli compliance with all his territorial demands, Arafat continues his complete juggling act of encouraging violence and talking peace at one and the same time.

At the very least, we can expect from Arafat more of the same brinksmanship through the last days of the Clinton Administration, though we don't know what, if anything, will come of it. Knowing how eager the American leader is to leave the political scene with substantial progress to show in the Middle East given his extraordinary investment of time, energy, and the prestige of the presidency, and aware of how committed the Israeli leader has been to making this possible on Clinton's watch, Arafat will squeeze the moment for all it's worth, and then some, in an effort to improve still further his bargaining position.

Not quite, some observers will note. Arafat doesn't hold all the cards. After all, there's an Israeli election around the corner and, without a peace deal, the conventional wisdom is that Barak will fall and Arafat will

then have to face his old nemesis, Ariel Sharon, who will make the Palestinian leader's life a lot more difficult. Maybe, but then again, maybe not.

We in the West make a living out of failing to understand the Middle East. We're so busy superimposing our own deeply ingrained ways of thinking on the region—based in large measure on our rationalism, pragmatism, willingness to compromise, and tendency to mirror-image ("surely they're like us and want the very same things in life as we do")—that we too often end up surprised and puzzled when things don't go as we might expect.

We don't speak Arabic; we have little contact with Arab culture; we have minimal understanding of the nature of Islam and its pervasive role in the life of the Arab world; we spend too little time reading the writings of Judith Miller, Bernard Lewis, Fouad Ajami, and other knowledgeable observers of the region; and we embrace too quickly as representative those selected Arab voices that sound reassuring to us.

Yet none of this stops us from thinking we know enough about the region to offer grounded views on diplomacy and strategy. Indeed, the U.S. Government, with its far greater resources and expertise, has stumbled more than once, with fatal consequences, trying to make its way across the Middle East minefields.

Isn't it just possible that the prospect of a Prime Minister Sharon not only doesn't frighten Arafat but actually appeals to him? Taking a page from Leon Trotsky—the worse it gets, the better it becomes—Arafat may, in fact, perceive advantages in such an outcome: with Sharon demonized in the international news media and sharply criticized in world capitals, Israel could face new international pressures, including renewed calls for UN intervention and increased sympathy for a unilateral declaration of independence.

TESTS FOR BARAK AND SHARON

And this brings us back to Israel's domestic predicament. Barak, the pollsters say, needs a peace deal before February 6 if he is to have a chance at winning the election. Without it, he is saddled with negative images—accusations of political ineptness, willingness to yield to the demands of religious parties despite his calls to marginalize them, and inexperience and imprudence in dealing with the Palestinians. Thus, no matter what he says between now and February 6, no matter how tough his language may be at times, the prevailing assumption is that he needs Arafat to bail him out and both men know it.

On the other hand, Sharon is a known quantity who is a deeply polarizing figure in Israel. He is seen as representing a return to the Shamir years of a "fortress Israel" in eternal conflict with the enemies of the Jewish people. That will not sit well, not for long, I suspect, with many Israelis living in a prospering first-world country that longs for regional stability and even a chilly peace with its neighbors, so that it can finally one day turn to the future and away from the endless cycles of violence of the past.

After all, if the Israeli left was revealed to be the victim of its own illusions about creating a new Middle East, the Israeli right, illustrated by Sharon, has been the victim of its own illusions about the possibility of maintaining an indefinite status quo of occupation. If Barak is found wanting by the Israeli electorate in his ability to provide answers and solutions, then it's equally likely Sharon, if elected prime minister, will face the same prospect within short order, unless he is able to turn in entirely new policy directions.

Of course, whoever is elected, Barak or Sharon, will face the very same unruly and